

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
TERRE HAUTE DIVISION

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| CHARLES DAVID ABEL, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No. 2:23-cv-00057-JPH-MKK |
| |) | |
| DOUG VANTLIN, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE MOTION
FOR ASSISTANCE WITH RECRUITING COUNSEL**

Plaintiff Charles David Abel has filed a motion for assistance recruiting counsel. Dkt. 3. Litigants in federal civil cases do not have a constitutional or statutory right to court-appointed counsel. *Walker v. Price*, 900 F.3d 933, 938 (7th Cir. 2018). Instead, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) gives courts the authority to "request" counsel. *Mallard v. United States District Court*, 490 U.S. 296, 300 (1989). As a practical matter, there are not enough lawyers willing and qualified to accept a pro bono assignment in every pro se case. *See Watts v. Kidman*, 42 F.4th 755, 764 (7th Cir. 2022) (explaining that courts must be careful stewards of the limited resource of volunteer lawyers); *Olson v. Morgan*, 750 F.3d 708, 711 (7th Cir. 2014) ("Whether to recruit an attorney is a difficult decision: Almost everyone would benefit from having a lawyer, but there are too many indigent litigants and too few lawyers willing and able to volunteer for these cases.").

"When confronted with a request under § 1915(e)(1) for pro bono counsel, the district court is to make the following inquiries: (1) has the indigent plaintiff made a reasonable attempt to obtain counsel or been effectively precluded from

doing so; and if so, (2) given the difficulty of the case, does the plaintiff appear competent to litigate it himself?" *Eagan v. Dempsey*, 987 F.3d 667, 682 (7th Cir. 2021) (quoting *Pruitt v. Mote*, 503 F.3d 647, 654 (7th Cir. 2007)). These two questions "must guide" the Court's determination whether to attempt to recruit counsel. *Id.* These questions require an individualized assessment of the plaintiff, the claims, and the stage of litigation. *See Pruitt*, 503 F.3d at 655-56.

The first question, whether litigants have made a reasonable attempt to secure private counsel on their own, "is a mandatory, threshold inquiry that must be determined before moving to the second inquiry." *Eagan*, 987 F.3d at 682; *see also Thomas v. Anderson*, 912 F.3d 971, 978 (7th Cir. 2019) (because plaintiff did not show that he tried to obtain counsel on his own or that he was precluded from doing so, the judge's denial of these requests was not an abuse of discretion). Plaintiff has contacted only one entity, the Indiana State Bar Association. *See* dkt. 3 at 2. Accordingly, the Court finds that he has not made a reasonable effort to recruit counsel on his own before seeking the Court's assistance. *See Thomas*, 912 F.3d at 978. His motion for assistance with recruiting counsel, dkt. [3], must therefore be **denied**.

Plaintiff's motion for assistance recruiting counsel is **denied without prejudice**. Dkt. 3. The Court will remain alert to changes in circumstances that may warrant reconsideration of the motion, such as a settlement conference or trial.

SO ORDERED.

Date: 4/28/2023



James Patrick Hanlon
United States District Judge
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

CHARLES DAVID ABEL
7059 North Rod and Gun Club Road
Bicknell, IN 47512